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Executive Summary

In 2017 The Garrett County Judy Center Partnership (GCJCP) set an ambitious goal and set challenging headline performance measures (HPMs). They were able to successfully met 75% (6/8) of the headline performance measures.

One of the two unmet HPMs focused on Maryland EXCELS levels. Seventy-three percent (8/11) of programs met that HPM. With the continued GCJCP support the remaining three programs were able to reach that HPM Maryland EXCELS objective in 2018.

The other unmet HPM was for a 5% increase in kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Language and Literacy development from Fall 2015 readiness scores as measured by the KRA. The objective to increase from Fall 2015 baseline scores was not met, but the scores did increase based on the previously lower scores reported for 2016. To address this unmet headline performance measure the GCJCP plans to continue to maintain a focus on Language and Literacy, especially with their efforts to increase family involvement and training.

The geographical size of Garrett County, and the often severe winter weather conditions, present a rather unique challenge for providing services and partnering with other organizations. In 2017 the Judy Center staff maintained numerous partnerships with a variety of organizations. Some of those efforts were supported by having expanded grants to cover both the Northern and Southern portions of the county.

One of the biggest accomplishments in 2017 was the collaboration with partners to start the Nurturing Family parenting classes. The first class was held in spring 2017. Other innovative and collaborative efforts, such as the Learning Bus, were contained and modified based on client feedback.

The Judy Center staff in the past have used a variety of standard and innovative methods to survey their client populations for feedback. Seven Parent Cafés were held throughout the county to obtain data from the participating parents. One data finding was that parents felt supported and nurtured by the Parent Café process, as well as gaining insights for ways they could improve their parenting skills.
Teachers and the Steering Committee were surveyed in 2017 via electronic questionnaires. Data from those surveys, along with the Parent Café evaluations data, are discussed in more detail in this report (Section E: Survey Results).

**Goal: 2017 for Northern and Southern Grants**

The overall goal for 2017 was met. Goals for the two previous fiscal years were also met. Goal data from 2015 was used as the baseline for the 2017 goal. Table A-1, below, contains the 2017 goal and the data used to show the goal success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Goal Met or Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Fall 2017, the percentage of Southern and Northern Garrett County Judy Center kindergarten children demonstrating readiness for kindergarten will increase 5% from the Fall 2015 total composite baseline score as measured by the KRA.</td>
<td>By Fall 2017, the percentage of Southern and Northern Garrett County Judy Center kindergarten children demonstrating readiness for kindergarten increased 12% from the Fall 2015 total composite baseline score as measured by the KRA.</td>
<td>The FY 2017 goal was met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017-62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous years met: 2016-60% 2015-50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-1. Goal and Goal Status

**Headline Performance Measures: 2017**

The eight Headline Performance Measures for FY 17 are detailed in Table A-2. Six (75%) of the eight HPMs were met; 25% (6/8) of the HPMs were not met. The future course of action for unmet HPM 1B is for the two-family child care programs and the one child care center was to continue to work on reaching MD EXCELS level 4. The Judy Center maintained support and resources to those three programs. The programs did meet this objective in 2018.

HPM 4A was not met. It called for a 5% increase in kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Language and Literacy development from the Fall 215 KRA readiness scores. The 2017 Language and Literacy scores decreased by 5% from 2015. However, the scores increased by 8% from the FY 2016 data. Although the HPM was not met using FY 2015 data, there was a positive gain based on the FY 2016 data. The GCJP plans to continue to maintain a focus on Language and Literacy, especially with their efforts to increase family involvement and training.

---

1 For 2017 the Goal and HPMs were combined (with MSDE approval) into one grant application. However Northern and Southern each had a separate budget.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headline Performance Measures</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Headline Performance Measure Met or Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEADLINE PERFORMANCE MEASURE #1: High Quality Early Care and Education Practices.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1A. By June 2017, 75% of Southern and Northern Kindergarten, Prek, Head Start/Early Head Start, and child care teachers will attend four (4) or more staff development trainings or collaborative events.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1A. By June 2017, 84% (48/57) of Southern and Northern Kindergarten, Prek, Head Start/Early Head Start, and child care teachers attended four (4) or more staff development trainings or collaborative events.</strong></td>
<td>The HPM was met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1B. By June 2017, 100% of Pre-K, Head Start, and child care partners will be published at a level 4 or higher in Maryland EXCELS.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1B. By June 2017, 73% (8/11) of Pre-K, Head Start, and child care partners were published at a level 4 or higher in Maryland EXCELS.</strong></td>
<td>The HPM was not met. Two family child care programs and one child care center continue to work on reaching MD EXCELS level 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEADLINE PERFORMANCE MEASURE #2: Provide support and outreach to families with children birth to five (5).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2A. By June 2017, the number of Southern and Northern JC children who participate in services/activities but are not enrolled in partner programs will increase by 20% from FY 16.</strong></td>
<td><strong>2A. By June 2017, the number of Southern and Northern JC children who participate in services/activities but are not enrolled in partner programs increased 62% (104 to 169) from FY 16.</strong></td>
<td>The HPM was met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2B. By June 2017, the number of families participating in Pathway Plans managed by Judy Center Service Coordinators will increase by 20% from FY 16.</strong></td>
<td><strong>2B. By June 2017, the number of families participating in Pathway Plans managed by Judy Center Service Coordinators increased 20% (20 to 24) from FY 16.</strong></td>
<td>The HPM was met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HEADLINE PERFORMANCE MEASURE #3: Support Social/Emotional Development and Transition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3A.</th>
<th>By Fall 2017, the percentage of Southern and Northern Judy Center kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Social Foundations will increase 5% from the Fall 2015 readiness score as measured by the KRA.</th>
<th>The HPM was met.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3A. | By Fall 2017, the percentage of Southern and Northern Judy Center kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Social Foundations increased 14% from the Fall 2015 readiness score as measured by the KRA. | 2015-56%  
2016-68%  
2017-70% |
| 3B. | By June 2017, 75% of Southern and Northern kindergarten, Prek, HS, EHS, and child care teachers will be trained in CSEFEL. | The HPM was met. |
| 3B. Met | By June 2017, 86% (49/57) of Southern and Northern kindergarten, Prek, HS, EHS, and child care teachers were trained in CSEFEL. | |}

### HEADLINE PERFORMANCE MEASURE #4: Support Language and Literacy Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4A.</th>
<th>By Fall 2017, the percentage of Southern and Northern kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Language and Literacy development will increase 5% from Fall 2015 readiness scores as measured by the KRA.</th>
<th>The HPM was not met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4A. | By Fall 2017, the percentage of Southern and Northern kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Language and Literacy development decreased 5% from Fall 2015 readiness scores as measured by the KRA. | 2015-59%  
2016-46%  
2017-54%  
(2017 Language & Literacy scores decreased 5% from 2015 but increased 8% from 2016.) |
| 4B. | By June 2017, 75% of Southern and Northern children in kindergarten, pre-k, Head Start or child cares receiving academic intervention in language and literacy will meet 100% of their goals. | The HPM was met. |
| 4B. | By June 2017, 92% (59/64) of Southern and Northern children in kindergarten, pre-k, Head Start or child cares receiving academic intervention in language and literacy will meet 100% of their goals. | |}

Table A-2. 2017 Headline Performance Measures and Achievement Status
**Goal: 2018 for Northern and Southern Grants**

The Goal and Headline Performance Measures as stated in the grant application are provided in two tables below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL: By Fall 2018, the percentage of Southern and Northern Garrett County Judy Center kindergarten children demonstrating readiness for kindergarten will increase at least 5% from the Fall 2016 total composite scores as measured by the KRA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Table A-3. 2018 Headline Performance Measures and Achievement Status**

**Headline Performance Measures (Objectives): 2018**

1. **Support Language, Literacy, and Math Skills**
   1A. By Fall 2018, the percentage of Southern kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Language and Literacy development will increase from 34% to 44% and Northern kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Language and Literacy development will increase from 80% to 85% from Fall 2016 readiness scores as measured by the KRA.
   1B. By Fall 2018, the percentage of Southern kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Mathematic development will increase from 47% to 53% and Northern kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Mathematic development will increase from 68% to 73% from Fall 2016 readiness scores as measured by the KRA.
   1C. By Fall 2018 the percentage of kindergarten children with prior Head Start experience that demonstrate readiness for kindergarten will increase 10% from the Fall 2016 total composite score as measured by the KRA.

2. **Support Social/Personal Development/Transition**
   2A. By Fall 2018, the percentage of Southern Judy Center kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Social Foundations will increase from 63% to 68% and the Northern Judy Center kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Social Foundations will increase from 84% to 86% from the Fall 2016 readiness scores as measured by the KRA.
   2B. By June 2018, 75% of Southern and Northern kindergarten, Prek, HS, EHS, and child care teachers will receive staff development in social-emotional development and behavior strategies by a national behavior consultant.
   2C. By August 2018, 50% of Head Start and Child Care four (4) year olds will participate in three (3) or more transition activities at their elementary school.

---

2 For 2018 the Goal and HPMs were combined (with MSDE approval) into one grant application. However Northern and Southern each had a separate budget.
3. Provide support and outreach to families with children birth to five (5).

3A. By June 2018, the number of Southern and Northern JC children who participate in services/activities but are not enrolled in partner programs will increase by 8% from FY 17.

3B. By June 2018, the number of families participating in Pathway Plans managed by JC Service Coordinators will increase by 10% from FY 17.

4. High Quality Early Care and Education Practices.

4A. By June 2018, 75% of Southern and Northern Kindergarten, Prek, Head Start/Early Head Start, and child care teachers will attend three (3) or more staff development trainings or collaborative events.

4B. By June 2018, 70% of Pre-K, Head Start, Early Head Start, and child care partners will be published at a level 5 in Maryland EXCELS.

Table A-4. 2018 Headline Performance Measures
Enrollment by Program and Age in All Judy Center Programs

The Garrett County Judy Center Program has children enrolled in nine different partner programs. Table B-1 shows the enrollment by age and programs for 2017. Table B-2 has enrollment breakout for 2018. Please note, there is some double counting in the table since some children may be enrolled in more than one of the nine partner programs. Child care in the table does not pertain to wraparound.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Programs</th>
<th># of Children Enrolled</th>
<th>Birth to 3 years old</th>
<th>3 year olds</th>
<th>4 year olds</th>
<th>5 year olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prekindergarten</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’s classroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Center Playgroups</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Head Start</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: LBC Bus</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Families</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>976</strong></td>
<td><strong>291</strong></td>
<td><strong>178</strong></td>
<td><strong>307</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-1. 2017 Enrollment by Program and Age
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Programs</th>
<th># of Children Enrolled</th>
<th>Birth to 3 years old</th>
<th>3 year olds</th>
<th>4 year olds</th>
<th>5 year olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prekindergarten</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’s classroom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Center Playgroups/ Learning Beyond the Classroom Bus</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Head Start</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Care-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHS Home Based-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Families-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>937</strong></td>
<td><strong>323</strong></td>
<td><strong>172</strong></td>
<td><strong>209</strong></td>
<td><strong>233</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-2. 2018 Enrollment by Program and Age
Ethnicity of Enrollment Children

Table B-3 illustrates both the actual total enrollment number (total 795) and the Ethnicity/Race by age. Table B-4 has the corresponding data for 2018. These tables do not have duplicate counting. The larger number of White children reflects the overall ethnicity and race within Garrett County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity/Race Category</th>
<th>Birth to 3 years</th>
<th>3 year olds</th>
<th>4 year olds</th>
<th>5 year olds</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>262</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
<td><strong>178</strong></td>
<td><strong>795</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-3. 2017 Ethnicity/race of children enrolled in Judy Center Partnership Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity/Race Category</th>
<th>Birth to 3 years</th>
<th>3 year olds</th>
<th>4 year olds</th>
<th>5 year olds</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>264</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>187</strong></td>
<td><strong>221</strong></td>
<td><strong>804</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-4. 2018 Ethnicity/race of children enrolled in Judy Center Partnership Programs
**Enrollment History**

During its 15 years of operation, the Garrett County Judy Center Partnership has experienced noticeable enrollment shifts. The noticeable enrollment increase in 2015 was a result of an Expansion Grant. The Expansion Grant added new partner schools, new partner programs, and 434 additional children. The chart below plots the enrollment changes for the past five years.

![Enrollment History Chart](chart.jpg)

**Table B-5. Enrollment History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>N=319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>N=751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>N=783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>N=795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>N=804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Kindergarten Data

Except for 2014 the JC1 children appear to exceed the JC0 group. However, comparison between those two groups, the county, and state is difficult given the disparity of sample sizes. There does appear to be an upward trend for all the groups. The percentages are in Chart C-1 and the following table (C-2) shows the sample sizes per group by year.

Based on the MSDE Readiness Reports, in 2016 Garrett County lead the state with the highest average readiness levels for kindergartens. For 2017 Garrett moved to second place.

Chart C-1: KRA Composite Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC0</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Co</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>66,281</td>
<td>65,070</td>
<td>21,359</td>
<td>21,359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-2: Sample Sizes for Composite Scores
Domain Scores

Domain scores for each of the four KRA domains are shown, for better readability, via a separate chart for each of the years 2014-2017.

Chart C-3: 2014 Domain Scores

Chart C-4: 2015 Domain Scores
Chart C-5: 2016 Domain Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Foundations</th>
<th>Language &amp; Literacy</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Physical Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total n=171</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC0 n=36</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC1 n=135</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart C-6: 2017 Domain Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Foundations</th>
<th>Language &amp; Literacy</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Physical Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total n=205</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC0 n=56</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC1 n=149</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FARM Composite Scores

Judy Center children who are eligible for Free and Reduced Price Meals (FARM), like their peers in the county and the state, have lower composite scores or lower readiness. The sample sizes are too diverse to have significant comparisons.

Chart C-7: FARM Composite Scores
Special Education

The Garrett County Judy Center does not have any ELL children; only Special Education data is reported. Consistent over the time periods reported, and the groups reported, the Non-Special Education have higher KRA composite scores. For GCJCP the sample size may be a factor that makes the difference more noticeable.

![Chart C-8: Special Education and Non-Special Education Composite Scores]

Ethnicity and Gender

The sample sizes for non-White Judy Center children are too small to be significant. Ninety-eight percent (N=178) of the 5-year olds are White. Gender groups were also too small to report.
D: 3rd Grade Data

Judy Center Children and Non-Judy Center Children

Third grade data is obtained via the PARCC scores. Data is reported for students with GCJC Partnership experience (JC1), students in the Yough Glades school without GCJC Partnership experience (JC0), students in Garrett County (GC), and students in Maryland (MD).

Below are both charts and tables. The charts give a visual of the Levels 4 and 5 scores, reported in percentages, for Spring 2016 and Spring 2017. The N for each group is included in the chart.

The tables (D--2 and D-3) following the charts with all the five PARCC Levels are provided to better illustrate the difference in sample sizes. The sample sizes for JC1 and JC0 are quite different from the county and the state, thus making comparisons difficult.

3rd Grade Reading Scores:

The combined Level 4 and Level 5 scores as shown in Chart D-1 indicates JC1 students performed better than the JC0 group. Again, the disparity in sample sizes means caution is needed in comparing the four groups.

Chart D-1: Reading Scores in Percentages, Spring 2016 and 2017
### Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JC 1 (N=52)</th>
<th>JC 0 (N=13)</th>
<th>County (N=293)</th>
<th>State (N=67,758)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>19% (10)</td>
<td>38% (5)</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>21% (11)</td>
<td>15% (2)</td>
<td>29% (85)</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>33% (17)</td>
<td>23% (3)</td>
<td>29.4% (86)</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>27% (14)</td>
<td>23% (3)</td>
<td>18.8% (55)</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21.8% (64)</td>
<td>21.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-2: 2016 Reading Scores with Percentages and Total Numbers by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JC1 (N=47)</th>
<th>JC0 (N=19)</th>
<th>County (N=267)</th>
<th>State (N=69,107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>6% (3)</td>
<td>37% (7)</td>
<td>26% (70)</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>15% (7)</td>
<td>32% (6)</td>
<td>20% (54)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>21% (11)</td>
<td>21% (4)</td>
<td>21% (57)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>53% (25)</td>
<td>10% (2)</td>
<td>30% (70)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3% (7)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-3: 2017 Reading Scores with Percentages and Total Numbers by Level

#### 3rd Grade Math Scores:

As noted above, comparisons of the JC1 students to those in the other groups is difficult with the small sample sizes of JC1 and JC0. Tables following the charts give both the sample size (N) and actual number in each level.

![Math: Spring 2016](chart_d-4-0.png) ![Math: Spring 2017](chart_d-4-1.png)

Chart D-4: Math Scores in Percentages, Spring 2016 and 2017
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Table D-5: 2016 Math Scores with percentages and total numbers by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>JC 1 (N=52)</th>
<th>JC 0 (N=13)</th>
<th>County (N= 293)</th>
<th>State (N=67,758)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>6% (3)</td>
<td>23% (3)</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>25% (13)</td>
<td>15% (2)</td>
<td>33.4% (98)</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>36% (19)</td>
<td>23% (3)</td>
<td>30% (88)</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>29% (25)</td>
<td>38% (5)</td>
<td>20.5% (60)</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>4% (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.9% (35)</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-6: 2017 Math Scores with percentages and total numbers by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>JC 1 (N=47)</th>
<th>JC 0 (N=19)</th>
<th>County (N= 267)</th>
<th>State (N=69,107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>13% (6)</td>
<td>26% (5)</td>
<td>15% (40)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>17% (8)</td>
<td>21% (4)</td>
<td>22% (60)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>36% (17)</td>
<td>32% (6)</td>
<td>27% (73)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>32% (15)</td>
<td>16% (3)</td>
<td>30% (79)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>5% (1)</td>
<td>6% (15)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partnership Survey Results

In recent years the Steering Committee (representing the Partnership) has been surveyed with some extensive questionnaires. The Steering Committee was polled not only on RBA-focused questions about clients served, how well clients were served, what services and resources might be added, modified, or stopped, etc., the Steering Committee was also asked questions related to communication style preferences, meeting logistics, familiarity with other partner roles, and frequency of meeting attendance.

Those electronic surveys yielded helpful data and suggestions that the Judy Center staff was generally able to implement to make meetings more effective and better attended. They were also able to modify services and resources based on Steering Committee feedback.

However, those surveys were often long and time consuming to complete. To avoid survey/feedback burnout the decision was made for 2017 to simplify the survey and limit it to three questions. Those questions were also asked to the teachers for comparison of the two groups. The three questions were close-ended, rating-type questions with optional comment box.

The survey link was emailed to 30 members of the Steering Committee. Twenty (66.6%) surveys were completed.

Services/Resources to teachers and Early Childhood Professionals

The twenty respondents all agree with the first question:

- The Judy Center Partnership provides many educational services and resources. For example, classroom supplies, training opportunities, validation/accreditation support, academic intervention, etc. These types of family focused services and resources are supportive and beneficial to teachers and early childhood professionals.

Fourteen (70%) Strongly Agreed and six (30%) Agreed with that statement. One comment was given: Also Maryland EXCELS support.
Services/Resources to Families

The second question focused on families:

- The Judy Center Partnership provided many services and resources to families. For example, Pathway Plans, referrals, home visits, career development, parent cafes, etc. These types of family focused services and resources are supportive and beneficial to families.

Fifty percent (10/20) Strongly Agreed and 45% (9/20) Agreed. There was one neutral response, however that respondent selected Strongly Agree for the other two questions. This was the only neutral response for the survey. The single comment added: They have also been sponsoring parenting classes.

School Readiness Support

The last question had the highest agreement rate and three comments were made.

- School readiness is supported by the Judy Center Partnership with activities such as playgroups, academic interventions, parent/child activities, summer transition camps, etc. These types of activities and resources are beneficial for supporting school readiness.

Seventeen (85%) Strongly Agreed and three (15%) Agreed. The three comments made: (1) Also the Learning Bus, (2) The Learning Beyond the Classroom bus is amazing!, (3) The Judy Center Partnership does a great job in all of the areas address in these three questions. The partnership offers a wide range of services and resources the support kindergarten readiness.

Teacher Survey Results

The sample size for the teacher survey was 48 with a return survey rate of 85% (41/48). Demographic information from the survey included geographic area and program or organization type.

The breakdown by geographic area was 29% (12/41) Northern Program and 29% (29/41) from the Southern area. Category or role in organization:

- Early Head Start Teacher 34% (14)
- Head Start Teacher 32% (13)
- Kindergarten Teacher 17% (7)
- Prek Teacher 15% (6)
- Child Care Provider 2% (1)

Twenty four percent (10) of the teachers indicated being new to the Judy Center that year. The majority, 76%, (31) had been with the Judy Center for more than a year.

**Judy Center Benefits and Differences Made**

The teacher survey had three of the questions that were also asked to the Steering Committee (above) about perceived Judy Center benefit to teachers/early childhood professionals, to families, and to supporting school readiness. The tables below compare the total teacher survey results to the Steering Committee results, plus shows the differences between teachers in Northern and Southern Garrett Co.

The Judy Center Partnership provides many educational services and resources. For example, classroom supplies, training opportunities, validation/accreditation support, academic intervention, etc. These types of family focused services and resources are supportive and beneficial to teachers and early childhood professionals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Teachers</th>
<th>Steering Comm.</th>
<th>Northern JC</th>
<th>Southern JC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=41)</td>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td>(n=12)</td>
<td>(n=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% Strongly Agree</td>
<td>70% Strongly Agree</td>
<td>92% Strongly Agree</td>
<td>62% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27% Agree</td>
<td>30% Agree</td>
<td>8% Agree</td>
<td>34% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% (1) Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8% Agree</td>
<td>3% (1) Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3% (1) Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E-1: Services/Support to teachers and EC Professionals

Only two responses were not either Strongly Agree or Agree. The only Strongly Disagree response may have been an error since that teacher selected strongly agree to the remaining questions. There was one Neutral response in the Steering Committee results.

The Judy Center Partnership provided many services and resources to families. For example, Pathway Plans, referrals, home visits, career development, parent cafes, etc. These types of family focused services and resources are supportive and beneficial to families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Teachers</th>
<th>Steering Comm.</th>
<th>Northern JC</th>
<th>Southern JC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=41)</td>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td>(n=12)</td>
<td>(n=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66% Strongly Agree</td>
<td>50% Strongly Agree</td>
<td>58% Strongly Agree</td>
<td>69% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34% Agree</td>
<td>45% Agree</td>
<td>42% Agree</td>
<td>31% Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School readiness is supported by the Judy Center Partnership with activities such as playgroups, academic interventions, parent/child activities, summer transition camps, etc. These types of activities are beneficial for supporting school readiness.

Table E-2: Services/Support to Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Teachers (n=41)</th>
<th>Steering Comm. (n=20)</th>
<th>Northern JC (n=12)</th>
<th>Southern JC (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71% Strongly Agree</td>
<td>85% Strongly Agree</td>
<td>67% Strongly Agree</td>
<td>72% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27% Agree</td>
<td>15% Agree</td>
<td>33% Agree</td>
<td>24% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% (1) Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3% (1) Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E-3: Services Supporting School Readiness

Services/Resources

The most extensive question on the survey sought teacher opinion on services and resources. Thirty-six Judy Center services and resources were listed. For each of the 36 items teachers were asked to select either (a) Continue to Provide, (b) Change/Modify, (c) Stop Providing, or (d) Not Applicable. Only the items with 100% agreement to continue are given in the table below.

The responses are reported for the four teacher populations. One Child Care Provider completed the survey. That sample size was too small to use and it would have revealed her identity if her responses were used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Classroom Supplies</th>
<th>Prek (n=6)</th>
<th>K (n=6)</th>
<th>EHS (n=14)</th>
<th>HS (n=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Collaboration Meetings</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Validation/Accreditation Support</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Spring Joint Staff Training</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TEDDY BEARS Training</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. K/PreK Conference*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Early Childhood Connections Conference</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MD Child Care Credentialing Program</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Academic Intervention Support</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Behavior Intervention Support</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Classroom Lessons</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Buster the Bus</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Learning Beyond the Classroom Bus*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Family Time Fun Events</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Playgroups</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Reading Nights</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Career Development*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Financial Counseling*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Pathway Plans*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Referrals for community resources such as clothes, child care, housing, etc.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Home Visits</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Service Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Family Resources such as diapers, cleaning products, lice kits, etc.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Assemblies</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Parent/Child Take Home Activity Calendar</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Book Give Aways</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Snacks &amp; Meals at Family Events</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Partner with Title I or Head Start Events</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Vision &amp; Hearing Screenings for children enrolled in Child Care</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Health &amp; Nutrition Resources</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Parent Cafés*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Summer Transition Camps</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Transition Field Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Transition Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Swimming Attire for “I Can Swim” Event</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Field Trip Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals of 100% Continue</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E-4: Services/Resources to Continue

Not all the services and resources apply to the various teacher groups, so it was expected to see some differences in their preferences. The lower percentage for the Early Head Start population is probably the most reflective of the uniqueness of their program compared to the more traditional classroom based programs.

There were seven items, marked with an asterisk, that none of the four groups selected 100% to continue. Six of those deal more directly with family services. More communication about those programs. However, except for the /PreK Conference that had one “Stop Providing” selection, none of other six had any “Stop Providing” selections. The question appears to differentiate some of the priorities that the teachers place on the services and resources.
Most Valuable Service/Resource

An optional open-ended survey question asked: Thinking back of this school year, what Judy Center Partnership service/resource was the most valuable to you and/or the children you teach?

The thirty-seven comments, as they were written, are given below. There were specific comments, such as references to a classroom rug and sensory boards. Some comments were more global or vague. For example, “all of them”.

Word counts showed some themes emerging. There were 20 references to funding, supplies (classroom or families), money, or materials. Next was comments about conferences or training (10 mentions). Family or parents was mentioned nine times. There were five comments about accreditation/validation. Interventions and lessons were mentioned three times.

1. The support from the Judy Center is the most valuable. They have provided engaging lessons for my students and also have helped me when I have needed anything.
2. Money for additional supplies any kind of support for parents struggling with their children and/or just trying to survive financially.
3. My class liked Buster the Bus and Learning Beyond the Classroom. These are great things for the kids! Also, the Judy Center planned really fun activities for families, like the gardening one. Our families really like the programs the Judy Center provides.
4. Assemblies
5. The resources that help us purchase classroom materials, all activities that encourage parent/child participation
6. The behavior interventions and kindergarten preparedness visits were very helpful for staff and students. The money to purchase STEM items and new classroom supplies was extremely helpful.
7. Honestly, the funding for extra supplies was the most beneficial.
8. With the resources and support in all areas
9. All of them.
10. Validation/accreditation assistance, supply money, behavior and intervention assistance,
11. I feel the support of supplies and the wonderful speakers and opportunities for staff development are top notch. Opportunities for families and children to attend events such as Reading Nights and Parent Cafe are a valuable resource to them. Also assemblies and support for programs after school for parents and students to attend are great!
12. So many to list; however, the purchase of a large rug for our classroom to use helped us in all activities; it made a great difference!!
13. Assemblies
14. Classroom supplies, sending teachers on field trips and trainings, and money for accreditation.
15. Child intervention, classroom supplies
16. Classroom supplies, sending teachers to conferences and trainings, the money for Accreditation $200.00
17. Classroom lessons
18. Reading night assistance and validation assistance.
19. Accreditation planning
20. TEDDY BEARS
21. resources
22. Collaboration meetings - I always walk away with information that is useful.
23. The money provided for the classroom for new supplies is wonderful. It is very nice to be able to provide new toys/resources to the children.
24. Classroom supplies
25. We really appreciate the $100 the Judy Center faithfully gives to our classroom. Last year, we used the money to make sensory boards for our infant classroom. This year we purchased items out of DSS and the kids are really enjoying them. These items, along with the sensory boards, are things we would not have otherwise been able to purchase. Thank you all so much!!
26. going to the training at the college and taking a class on how to add music with math.
27. Early Childhood Connections Conference
28. Early Childhood Trainings
29. Garrett College trainings
30. Supply availability, field trips.
31. Getting books for the classroom
32. Trainings for staff and trainings for parents
33. Most valuable is the provision of resources for the classrooms. We really appreciate that. Also, accreditation and validation support is very helpful. We love the Early Childhood Connections Conference.
34. Family resources
35. A lot of them are valuable
36. I can't really give one define answer. I enjoy the kids and the programs this facility has to offer.
37. Shapes, colors, some numbers.

Table E-5: Most Valuable Service/Resource

Judy Center Accessibility and Support

Teachers were asked about the number of times in the prior year they reached out to a Judy Center staff member for assistance, support, or resources for themselves, their classroom, their students, or their student’s families. Ninety-five percent of the teachers reached out, with the majority (36%) indicating they reached out 3-4 times.

There was agreement (71% Strongly Agree, 30% Agree) that when they did reach out the Judy Center staff was very accessible. Additionally, 71% Strongly Agreed and 24% Agree with the statement that the Judy Center Staff was able to provide the resources and support they requested.

Parent Survey Results

Parents were surveyed via evaluation forms distributed at the end of each of the seven (7) Parent Cafés that were done in summer and fall of 2016. The Cafés were held at five (5) different Judy Center schools with two Cafés held at Friendsville Elementary and Grantsville Elementary.
Evaluation forms were distributed to each of the 108 parents who attended a Café. The return rate was 76% (82/108). The form contained Agree/Disagree questions and Open-ended questions. The compiled results are shown and discussed below.

The first two questions were:
- The Parent Café was a welcoming and supportive place to be.
- Participating in this Parent Café was helpful to me.

Both questions had 100% agreement. The evaluation had eleven questions in response to this stem question:
- As a result of participating in this Parent Café.

The percentage responses to those questions are in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N=82)</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I realize I am not alone in my challenges or way I feel.</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>.01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I plan to take better care of myself.</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>.01%</td>
<td>.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I met someone I’d like to get together with again.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>.01%</td>
<td>.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I learned something that will help me as a parent.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>.01%</td>
<td>.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I will be more willing to ask for help when I need it.</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>.02%</td>
<td>.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I plan to change something about my parenting.</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>.04%</td>
<td>.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I plan to change how I listen to my child(ren).</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>.03%</td>
<td>.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I plan to try to understand my children’s feelings.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I’d like to participate in other things in my community.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>.01%</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I’d recommend Parent Cafés to other people.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I’d attend another Parent Café.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E-5: Parent Café Percentages

The last two questions mirror that responses of the initial two about the Parent Café and like those initial questions had 100% Agreement rating. The question with the lowest agreement (89% or 73/82) focused on plans to change something about their own parenting.

However, in the open-ended responses, discussed below, 59 parents provided open-ended responses regarding what they planned to do differently. There were 29 comments specifically focused on listening and communication as an area for change or a learning from the Café. Two of the comments are flagged with an asterisk. Those two parents indicated a need to listen more but those parents rated 3

Due to rounding some row percentages may be less than 100% total.
the question about plan to change how I listen to my children as Disagree or Not Applicable. So the ratings for those two questions seemed to conflict with the corresponding written comments.

In parallel with the rating questions (above) about the Café itself, the written comments also reflected the parents’ positive reaction to the event. There were 50+ comments using words or phrases: thank-you, great, fun, enjoyed, wonderful, nice, awesome, and good. “Nothing” as a single word comment was not included in the comment summary below.

Please share one thing you plan to do differently as a result of today’s Parent Café.

1. Explain to my kids “why” I may be in a bad mood instead of just saying so...
2. Breathe when stressed
3. Spend as much time as possible with my family
4. To attend other parent events
5. Listening more
6. Listen more*
7. Listening to my child
8. Be open to ideas from other parent
9. Listen before I speak
10. Spend more quality time together
11. Not react immediately to issues
12. We all go through things & we all make it through in our own way → patience
13. To be more understanding
14. I will be adding a box of stuff in the bathroom that can only be used during poopy time
15. Talk to my husband about real life events for the future
16. Be more open to meeting people
17. Talk to my little girl differently. This café came at a great time we had rough morning
18. More family activities
19. Listen more closely
20. Reaching out to other parents
21. Listen more to others
22. Take more time for myself
23. Make a place for children (will)
24. Listen to others more than I do now!
25. Listening & understanding their needs
26. Plan to have weekly family date night
27. Listen without interruptions
28. Listen more to my kids
29. Speaking more positively to my children
30. Be more firm & not too easy going
31. Listen better
32. Try to spend more quality time together
33. Be more patient & let my son be “little”
34. Be more “present” with my kids
35. Not use “why do you always” “Why do you never” phrases with my children
36. Listen & have more patience
37. Be more positive to everyone
38. Listen more without interrupting
39. Connect with others
40. Try to make more connections with other parents
41. Encourage others to attend
42. Reach out to other parents
43. Reach out more
44. [unclear word] friends
45. Ask for help if I need it
46. Listen better
47. Listen to everyone
48. Take time to listen to others
49. Build new relationships
50. Try to be a better listener
51. Better listening
52. Listen to my daughter more
53. Listen to my children more
54. Attend more family events
55. Be more aware of how I am teaching my children
56. Try harder to keep my cool
57. Be more resilient
58. Be more open to new people
59. Come to another café
What one this would be most helpful to you to be a strong parent or family?

1. Tangible employment
2. Strong communication
3. Learning more to understand & help my children
4. Ask question
5. Better co-parenting skills
6. Be supportive
7. More family time
8. We should spend more quality time together
9. More community activities
10. Strong support—patience
11. Understanding
12. Relationship support for mothers & fathers
13. Communication
14. Not being alone
15. Knowing I am not alone
16. Respect
17. Better listening
18. Have good foundations
19. Work on food budget, encourage friendships for my kids
20. Listening*
21. Listen more
22. Contact info for others involved
23. More concrete support
24. Balancing work & home
25. Same as above (Listen without interruptions)
26. Support, words of encouragement
27. Mom nights out
28. Be a better listener
29. Listening & communicating better
30. Be supportive
31. More community resources
32. To have strong connections with other parents
33. More supportive people in my life
34. Decent occupation
35. If my family would be more committed & present
36. More activities to do as a family
37. Knowing I’m not the only one with certain [sic]
38. Having a better job
39. Speaking with other parents
40. Better listening
41. Having more support & guidance
42. Not to be negative
43. Support system
44. Continuing to build our support circle
45. Parent Café
46. Support
47. More communication
48. Being a good listener
49. Talking & trust
50. Trust honesty
51. Spend time with others
52. Be a better listener
53. Continued support
54. Attend family events
55. Listening & communicating better
56. Be supportive
57. More community resources
58. To have strong connections with other parents
59. More supportive people in my life
60. Decent occupation
61. If my family would be more committed & present
What would you suggest we change for our next Parent Café?

1. Nothing—it was great
2. Keep the coffee out
3. Put out notices in back packs to remind parents its coming up
4. Nothing. Everything was great.
5. I enjoyed everything about it.
6. Meet & greet someone new for a minute, at least 5x’s (5min)
7. Nothing
8. Introductions would be nice
9. Leave beverages out
10. More parents participate
11. Provide water
12. More conversation time/open conversations
13. People leave too soon
14. If its possible to do an evening instead that would be great!
15. Have another one @ BF
16. Great experience
17. More socializing with people you don’t know
18. Nothing 😊
19. It was good! Nothing to change 😊
20. Nothing—everything was great. Enjoyed the kids joining
21. Nothing, its great
22. More parents invited
23. Nothing I liked it a lot
24. 

Anything else you’d like to share about today’s Parent Café?

1. Thank you!
2. Good program. Thank you
3. It was a nice experience
4. New. Interesting
5. It was lovely
6. Great group of people to share with
7. No, good informative time
8. It was wonderful. Thank you!!
9. It was wonderful
10. Very nice helpful
11. Nice!
12. I had fun & learned a lot
13. I had a wonderful time. Very informative & encouraging
14. Loved it 😊
15. Liked talking with others
16. It was great
17. It was a great day
18. Very interesting
19. Well done
20. 😊
21. Very inviting, free, & accepting!!
22. Needed this break & encouragement! Fun!
23. Today was awesome
24. A good time, thank you! 😊
25. It was great, thank you!
26. Thank you for today’s Café. I feel it was a benefit
27. Very nice people
28. Fun
29. It was enjoyable! Thanks!
30. Wonderful 😊
31. I’m so grateful for the opportunity to come
32. Thank you!!
33. This was a wonderful experience. I will definitely be back again
34. Great!
35. Very enjoyable
36. I had a great time!
37. It was great!
38. Was positive
39. Fun!
40. I really enjoyed myself
41. Nice morning, thank you!
42. Everyone was nice & helpful. It was great getting together with other adults
43. Had a good time
44. Had a good time. Wish the kids could involve someway besides breakfast
45. Good program. Thank you!! 😊
46. Everyone was very friendly & supportive. Thank you!
47. I enjoyed meeting new people. It was not what I expected. It was fun
The data reported here, along with other reviewed data, shows that the Garrett County Judy Center Partnership is making a difference: for children, for families, and for the community.

Much of the Judy Center’s recent successes can be attributed to the previous expansion grant. The two grants enabled the Judy Center to serve the entire county, plus expand their partnership and collaboration efforts with the Board of Education. It enabled the GCJCP staff to do more of what they are more uniquely positioned to do: outreach and serve families, especially those whose children are not yet in school.

In order to continue turning this curve, a recommendation is to reach more families and enroll more children. The GCJCP needs to receive the two grants so they can continue to expand and improve their partnerships and thus their work with families, child care programs, and schools.

That expanded outreach should result in increased enrollment. Serving more children would provide for better economies of scale and increase the return on investment (ROI) for the funding dollars.